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Mostert and Glasswell’s article features many useful, succinct points regarding improvement of literary fluency. In particular, fluency is identified as the main “missing link” to students’ lack of interest regarding individual as well as class reading. Lack of positive, successful reading experiences by students directly related to virtually no motivation of students to read. Simultaneously, the defect of confidence exhibited not only by students, but also teachers, served as literary quicksand for all parties involved. Therefore, teachers were then educated and armed with researched and proven fluency practices. These concepts included accuracy, speed, and prosody. In addition, the fluency teaching techniques were highlighted. According to Mostert and Glasswell (2012), these include modeling good oral reading, providing oral support and assistance, offering plenty of opportunities for practice, and encouraging fluency through phrasing. Through these techniques, Mostert and Glasswell (2012) conveyed that the “meaning connection” could be made.

I found this article to be a great educational source regarding fluency. Throughout the work, I could consistently tie the information back to our class. I think this article is a very useful real-life successful account of improving fluency amongst students. The reiteration of accuracy, speed, and prosody helped me deepen my understanding of those particular elements. Overall, I would definitely recommend this article to anyone interested in fluency.

Pilonieta, P. (2012). How fast is too fast? Fluency instruction in the classroom.

*California Reader, 45*(3), 8-12.

Pilonieta exposes the reader to a lesser known trouble of excessive significance of literary fluency teaching in the classroom. Fluency is an absolute irreplaceable element of comprehension that must be addressed properly in the classroom. However, this article reveals an abundance of unnecessary instructional time spent on fluency – even when students already possess fluency. The author observes two classroom which spend upwards of thirty minutes daily addressing reading rate. Reading rate assessment involved students partnering and reading aloud to one another, in what unintentionally seemed to result in more of a competition of spitting out words. Students became obsessed with their words per minute. Their reading rates were sometimes noted to be as high as 190 WPM. As mentioned by the author, if teachers were better versed in the norms of reading rates, perhaps they would realize there comes a time to move on from one form of fluency assessment to another. Clearly, CWPM is no longer necessary in the classes observed by the author. However, one can understand the ease of using CWPM as a sometimes effective assessment tool – just not every day. Perhaps if the teachers focused on additional fluency concepts such as prosody and adjusting reading rate, students would not be as concerned with racing each other while reading. Through a combination of reading strategies and tools, the overall goal of reading comprehension is much more realistic and attainable.

This article allowed the reader a candid look inside reading instruction. I would absolutely recommend this article to any current or future teacher, as well as parent of any student. As a future teacher, it is easy to envision a reading classroom that focuses on all the components of reading. However, as this article demonstrates, even the literacy coach had recommended focusing solely on reading rate. Therefore, it is up to us as future teachers to educate ourselves with the norms of reading performance in order to better tailor our teaching to true student needs.

Kostewicz, D. E. (2012). Implementing systematic practice to build reading fluency

via repeated readings. *New England Reading Association Journal, 47*(2), 17-

22.

Kostewicz addresses practice as the main source of improving reading fluency. Another interesting claim by the author regards practiced oral reading, rather than sustained silent reading, as a more effective tool for fluency improvement. Repeated, practiced readings address the need of teachers to differentiate between student abilities. Practiced oral readings are also more beneficial to time constraints of the classroom. The oral readings should be grade-level passages, selected by the teacher, of roughly 200 words. The teacher should establish a goal for the student’s reading. Once this goal is reached, another passage is to be assigned. The author encourages at least weekly practice of this, if not daily. Through careful discussed error corrections with the teacher, the student is able to learn from errors, and modify reading behaviors.

I found this article to be extremely wordy for the point at hand. I feel like the constant in-text citations were a constant distraction from my personal comprehension of this text. I wish the author had written with more energy, rather than a boring textbook narrative. However, once I did some re-reading of my own, I did like the point of practicing repeated passages as a form of progressing reading fluency.